



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/231.656 04/25/94 ROSE

D P1219941

EXAMINER

E3M1/0208

JAMES W. PETERSON
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS
P.O. BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2307

DATE MAILED: 02/08/96

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 11/1/96 ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-39 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-39 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to applicant's communication filed November 1, 1995.
2. Applicants have amended claim 5; and added new claims 28-39.
3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.
4. Claim 1-39 are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statement filed on September 7, 1995 has been placed in the application file, and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Drawings

6. Applicant is reminded that in order to avoid an abandonment of this application, the drawings must be corrected in accordance with the instructions set forth in Paper No. 3, mailed on August 1, 1995.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. Claims 15, 18, 33 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following terms lack proper antecedent basis:

Claim 15, "wherein a vector" is not defined or introduced in a previous claim.

Claim 18, "wherein said messages" is not defined or introduced in a previous of claim.

Claim 33, "wherein a vector" is not defined or introduced in a previous of claim.

Claim 35, "wherein said messages" is not defined or introduced in a previous of claim.

The remaining claims are rejected for incorporating the errors of their respective base claims by dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

9. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bussey et al., "Service Architecture, Prototype Description, and Network Implications of a personalized information Grazing Service.", IEEE INFOCOM, 1990, pages 1049-1053 in view of Sheth et al., "Evolving agents for Personalized information filtering." IEEE, 1993, Pages 345-352.

10. As to claim 1, Bussey et al. show the invention substantially as claimed, including a data processing 'DP' system, an information access system for automatically presenting users with items of interest, comprising: a computer system containing a database of information items to present to users [FIG. 1, database]; at least one access device for enabling users to communicate with computer system and access any information [FIG. 1, section 3.1, and 3.2]; means for storing a user profile for each user [col. 2, lines 29-31]; means for enabling the user to indicate that user's interest in each retrieved item [see section 2.2, Service Description]; and means for updating the user's profile in response to indications of interest by the user [FIG. 1, profile Update, col. 2, lines 39-41 and col. 3, lines 7-

11]. Bussey et al. disclose the claimed invention except for ranking the likely degree of interest for each item in accordance with a user profile, and presenting the items of information to an access device. On the other hand, Sheth et al. disclose the invention of personalized information filter agents with the ranking degree of interest and presenting the items of information [see sections 3]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined ranking the likely degree of interest and presentation of the items of information taught by Sheth et al. with personalized interest information taught by Bussey et al. A combination would have further improved the network database systems of the Bussey et al.'s system for ranking and displaying results of the relevant information of interested users.

(Applicants argue that the Bussey et al. reference does not disclose the database of information is global, unified and unstructured. The examiner disagrees that with the applicant. As shown in section 2.2, last paragraph, Bussey et al. disclose the database containing unstructured information [eg. text, voice, graphic . . .], unified and global [eg. service providers to all the users as central database in section 3.4, the last paragraph])

11. As to claims 2-4 and 7-16, they have been noted above in the rejection based upon Sheth et al. disclose all the limitations of the ranking means [see section 3 the algorithm].

12. Claims 5-6 and 28-33 encompass the same scope of the invention as that claims 1-4 and 7-16. The claims are rejected for the same reasons as set forth above.

13. As to claim 17, Bussey et al. disclose the invention methods that comprise the steps of: storing items of information in an unstructured database within the computer system [section 3.1, first paragraph]; Determining and storing user profiles for users of the computer system that have access to the items of information [col. 4, lines 4-9]; receiving a request from a user for access to the stored information [see section 3.4, first paragraph]. Bussey et al. do not explicitly disclose a specification of determining the ranking of the user's likely degree interest in the item of information stored and displaying the items of information with an indication of their relative ranking. On the other hand, Sheth et al. disclose the invention of personalized information filter agents with the determining the ranking degree of interest and presenting the items of information [see sections 3]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined ranking the likely degree of interest and presentation

the items of information taught by Sheth et al. with personalized interest information taught by Bussey et al. A combination would have further improved the network database systems of the Bussey et al.'s system by processing and displaying results of the relevant information of interested users.

14. As to claims 18-20 and 22-27 have been noted above in the rejection based upon Sheth et al. disclose all the limitations of the ranking means [see section 3 the algorithm].

15. As to claim 21, Sheth et al. also disclose the steps of selecting an item of information from those that are displayed [see fig. 4, section 4, second paragraph].

16. The limitations of claims 34-39 have been noted in the rejection of claims 17-27. The claims are rejected for the same reasons as set forth above.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Priest (5,167,011) "Method for coordinating information storage and retrieval." (364/200)

Chang et al. (5,321,833) "Adaptive ranking system for information retrieval." (395/600)

Serial Number: 08/231,656
Art Unit: 2307

-8-

Kaplan et al. (5,446,891) "System for adjusting hypertext links with weighed user goals and activities." (395/600)

Name of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cuan Pham whose telephone number is (703) 308-6684. The Examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Thursdays from 7:00 AM until 4:30 PM and also on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black, can be reached on (703) 305-9707. The Fax phone number for this group are (703) 305-9564 or (703) 305-9565. NOTE: Documents transmitted by facsimile will be entered as official documents on the file wrapper unless clearly marked "DRAFT".

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

CP
January 31, 1996

Thomas G. Black
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2300